



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,320	10/14/2003	Martin Ball	D/A1547Q	5013

25453 7590 07/11/2007
PATENT DOCUMENTATION CENTER
XEROX CORPORATION
100 CLINTON AVE., SOUTH, XEROX SQUARE, 20TH FLOOR
ROCHESTER, NY 14644

EXAMINER

CHENG, PETER L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/11/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/685,320	BALL ET AL.	
	Examiner Peter L. Cheng	Art Unit 2609	

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 October 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/14/2003 and 6/28/2004
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - There are some typographical and grammatical errors in the disclosure; for example, **paragraph 5, lines 5 - 6** ("the tag held by the user communicate through radio frequency"), **paragraph 44, line 2** ("whether they are stored at the printing device or that are stored");
 - Regarding the preliminary amendment and paragraph titled, "CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATION", U.S. Patent application numbers should be entered for each of the three cited applications; it is assumed that these are, in order: **10/684,627**, **10/685,238** and **10/685,109**.

Appropriate correction is required.

2. The use of the trademark **Bluetooth™** [paragraph 24, line 7 and claim 18, line 1] has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 7, 8 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - Both claims refer to "**the signal**" in claim 5; however, claim 5 does not cite a signal; it is assumed that applicant intended to make claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 6, instead of claim 5;
 - If both claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 6, it is not clear whether "**the signal**" refers to the signal which is sent, the signal which is received, or both; it is assumed that applicant intended to refer to both sent and received signals;
4. Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - Claim 10 refers to "**the scanner**" in claim 8; however, claim 8 does not cite a scanner; it is assumed that applicant intended to make claim 10 depend from claim 9, instead of claim 8;
5. Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Art Unit: 2609

- Claim 18 refers to “**the radio signals**”; it is assumed that applicant intended to make claim 18 depend from claim 17; that is, claim 18 can not be dependent from itself;

6. Claim 19 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- **Line 5:** it is not clear “what” is contained on the electronic tag when applicant cites “**bringing an electronic tag containing in close proximity to a tag reader ...**”;

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 18 contains the trademark/trade name Bluetooth™. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify

a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe radio signals that conform to the IEEE standard 802.15.1 and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

9. Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 14, 15, 17, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by **WEAVER [US Patent Application 2003/0160992 A1]**.

As for claim 1, WEAVER teaches a method for allowing access to at least one specialty function of a printing device [*Fig. 1, printing device 110 “refers to any device(s) that is able to receive information and convert the information to hard copy. By way of example, printers, facsimile machines and multi-function devices are printing devices”;* *page 2, paragraph 23, lines 8 - 11*] having a plurality of functions, comprising:

scanning a tag [Fig. 4, tag 410; page 2, paragraph 30, lines 1 - 5];

receiving information from the tag [Fig. 6 step 610 “where information corresponding to user authorization is received. In particular, the information corresponds to whether the user is authorized to enable one or more features of the printing device”; page 4, paragraph 44, lines 3 – 6.]

allowing access to the at least one specialty function, if appropriate information is received from the tag [Fig. 6, in step 640 “the feature(s) of the printing device is enabled using the feature-enabling information”; page 4, paragraph 44, lines 15 - 16].

Regarding claim 6, WEAVER further teaches the method of claim 1,
wherein reading a tag includes sending a signal to the tag [Fig. 4 transmitter/receiver 420 sends a signal to the tag. “Preferably, printer device 110 implements ID reader system 320, which includes a transmitter/receiver (Tx/Rx) 420 and a control/sequencer 430”; page 2, paragraph 30, lines 5 - 8],

and receiving a signal containing information about the tag from the tag [Fig. 4 Tx/Rx control 450; “In order to transmit data back to the ID reader system, the tag typically uses load modulation”; page 2, paragraph 31, lines 1 - 2].

Regarding claim 7, WEAVER further teaches the method,

wherein the signal is a radio frequency signal [“In some embodiments, the information corresponding to the user authorization is provided via a Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) tag”; **page 2, paragraph 26, lines 6 - 8**.]

Regarding claim 9, WEAVER further teaches the method of claim 1,

wherein the device includes a scanner [**Fig.1**, printing device **110** “refers to any device(s) that is able to receive information and convert the information to hard copy. By way of example, printers, facsimile machines and multi-function devices are printing devices”; **page 2, paragraph 23, lines 8 – 11**. Both facsimile and multi-function printing devices contain a scanner.]

Regarding claim 14, WEAVER further teaches a printing device, comprising:

a scanner [**Fig.1**, printing device **110** “refers to any device(s) that is able to receive information and convert the information to hard copy. By way of example, printers, facsimile machines and multi-function devices are printing devices”; **page 2, paragraph 23, lines 8 – 11**. Both facsimile and multi-function printing devices contain a scanner.];

a user interface through which a user may access a plurality of features of the device [**As just mentioned**, Weaver teaches that the printing device can be a multi-function device. Such devices inherently include a user interface which allows one to select from a plurality of device features.];

a tag reading system [Fig. 4 illustrates a "tag" 410 being read by a "printing device" 110]

a controller that allows access to at least one specialty feature a user can access based upon information received from a tag [Fig. 5 illustrates a printing device 110 "that can be used to implement a feature-enabling system"; page 3, paragraph 33, lines 3 – 4. This device includes a processor 502, memory 504, and one or more input and/or output (I/O) devices 506"; page 3, paragraph 35, lines 2 - 3].

Regarding claim 15, WEAVER further teaches the device of claim 14,
wherein the tag reading system communicates wirelessly ["In some embodiments, the information corresponding to the user authorization is provided via a Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) tag"; **page 2, paragraph 26, lines 6 – 8.** RFID is a form of wireless communications.]

Regarding claim 17, WEAVER further teaches the device of claim 15,
wherein the tag reading system communicates using radio signals ["In some embodiments, the information corresponding to the user authorization is provided via a Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) tag"; **page 2, paragraph 26, lines 6 – 8].**

Regarding claim 19, WEAVER teaches a method for transferring documents from one location to another, comprising:

sending at least one document to be transferred to the queue of a device having facsimile capabilities [Fig.1, printing device 110 "refers to any device(s) that is able to receive information and convert the information to hard copy. By way of example, printers, facsimile machines and multi-function devices are printing devices"; page 2, paragraph 23, lines 8 – 11.];

bringing an electronic tag containing in close proximity to a tag reader operably connected to the device having facsimile capabilities so that the tag may be read and information is sent to the facsimile machine [Fig. 4, shows a tag 410 being read by the printing device 110; page 2, paragraph 30, lines 1 – 5. Fig. 6 step 610 shows the step where user authorization information is sent to the printing device.];

only transferring the job if the information from the tag includes authorization to use the facsimile capabilities of the device [Fig. 6 step 640 shows the step where certain features of the printing device are enabled based on the information sent from the tag].

Art Unit: 2609

10. Claims 1, 3, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by

TAKAMI [US Patent Application 2003/0071859 A1].

As for claim 1, TAKAMI teaches a method for allowing access to at least one specialty function of a printing device ["multifunction device"; **page 1, paragraph 12, lines 1 – 4;** see also **page 1, paragraph 2, lines 1 - 4**] having a plurality of functions, comprising:

scanning a tag ["non-contact IC card"; **page 3, paragraph 36, 2nd column, line 1**; **1**];

receiving information from the tag ["The non-contact IC card contains information on the visually impaired identification or the historical operational record of a particular individual"; **page 3, paragraph 36, 2nd column, lines 1 - 4**; **4**];

allowing access to the at least one specialty function, if appropriate information is received from the tag [Access to the printing device is made available to the visually impaired user after "the template control unit 30 fetches a specified template from the juke box storage and places it on the operational panel in response to the control unit 10. On the operational panel screen, the display unit 40 displays a function area that corresponds to the current operation"; **page 3, paragraph 36, 2nd column, lines 4 - 8**].

Regarding claim 3, TAKAMI further teaches the method of claim 1,
wherein the at least one specialty function includes at least one feature that assists a disabled user [“specified template”; **page 3, paragraph 36, 2nd column, lines 4 – 5; also, Fig. 5 voice output unit 60**].

Regarding claim 13, TAKAMI teaches a method for allowing disabled users access to a printing device [“multifunction device”; **page 1, paragraph 12, lines 1 – 4**; see also **page 1, paragraph 2, lines 1 - 4**] having a plurality of features, comprising:

scanning a tag [“non-contact IC card”; **page 3, paragraph 36, 2nd column, line 1**];

receiving information from the tag, wherein the information includes information regarding a user's disability [“The non-contact IC card contains information on the visually impaired identification or the historical operational record of a particular individual”; **page 3, paragraph 36, 2nd column, lines 1 - 4**];

enabling at least one feature that at least partially compensates for the user's disability [“specified template”; **page 3, paragraph 36, 2nd column, lines 4 – 5; also, Fig. 5 voice output unit 60**].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

13. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **WEAVER [US Patent Application 2003/0160992 A1]** in view of **SALGADO [US Patent 6,583,888 B1]**.

Regarding claim 2, WEAVER does not specifically teach the method of claim 1,
wherein the at least one specialty function includes a diagnostic routine.

However, SALGADO teaches an authorization service for use with a multifunctional printing system that grants access to one or more diagnostic functions of the printing

Art Unit: 2609

system [col. 2, lines 4 – 7; see also claim 5]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of WEAVER and SALGADO in order to facilitate and simplify access to a printing device's diagnostic subsystem by an authorized service technician.

14. Claim 3 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WEAVER [US Patent Application 2003/0160992 A1] in view of RUDD [US Patent 6,934,915 B2].

Regarding claim 3, WEAVER does not specifically teach the method of claim 1, **wherein the at least one specialty function includes at least one feature that assists a disabled user.**

However, RUDD teaches systems and methods for personalizing an electrical device interface. Electrical devices can "comprise imaging devices such as a scanner 104, digital camera 106, and multi-function peripheral (MFP) device 108 which is capable of various different functionalities such as photocopying, printing, scanning, faxing, emailing, etc"; **col. 2, lines 62 – 66.** RUDD further teaches that "interfaces can be made available that are designed for persons with special needs. For instance, an interface can be provided for the visually-impaired which has large fonts, oversized buttons, and a simplified layout absent of superfluous imagery which can be more easily used by persons that have difficulty seeing"; **col. 5, line 65 – col. 6, line 4.** RUDD

further teaches that the “interface adjustments noted above could be provided on a user-by-user basis so that the interface is personalized for each user of the computing device 110 and/or the electrical device 102. To attain this form of personalization, the device solution application 216 must recognize the user. Identification of the user can be effected through a common login procedure where the user’s interface selection has been stored by the interface personalization module 220”; **col. 6, lines 47 – 55.** It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of RUDD with those of WEAVER so that identification of the user could be effected simply by the method taught by WEAVER, and a person with special needs could be better served.

15. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by **WEAVER [US Patent Application 2003/0160992 A1]** in view of well-known prior art.

Regarding claim 4, WEAVER further teaches the method of claim 1, **wherein the tag is a badge** [Weaver teaches that the “tag” is an “identification tag”; **page 2, paragraph 30, lines 3 – 5.** An “identification tag” could include an employee identification badge as disclosed in the instant application. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to also use an employee identification badge as a tag. In this way, an employee would not have to carry an additional tag.]

Art Unit: 2609

16. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **WEAVER** [US Patent Application 2003/0160992 A1] in view of **HIBINO** [US Patent Application 2003/0093675 A1].

Regarding claim 5, WEAVER does not specifically teach the method of claim 1,

wherein the tag is part of a cellular telephone.

However, HIBINO teaches a system to perform “confidential printing” in which a print job is only initiated once a user is in proximity of the printing device. Specifically, by means of a Bluetooth™-capable cell phone, “when the user of the PC 4 enters the Piconet area with the cell phone 6, which is powered ON, the printer detects the cell phone 6, and a printing job is initiated”; **page 8, paragraph 142.** It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of HIBINO with WEAVER to enable a Bluetooth™-capable cell phone to replace the tag as taught by WEAVER thereby, allowing a user to just carry his or her cell phone as an identification means.

17. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **WEAVER** [US Patent Application 2003/0160992 A1] in view of **KONSELLA** [US Patent Application 2003/0206311 A1].

Regarding claim 8, WEAVER does not specifically teach the method,

wherein the signal is an infrared signal.

However, KONSELLA teaches a method and apparatus for providing personalized print content for a specific user. A printing device detects the identity of a user by means of a communication device. In a method similar to that disclosed by WEAVER, the "personal identification can also be provided electronically. For example, a badge, card, or some other personal item bearing a bar code, magnetic strip, memory chip, etc. can be swiped or temporarily inserted into printer 202. The personal identification can also be provided to printer 202 wirelessly (e.g., infrared, radio frequency transmitter, 802.11, etc.)"; **page 2, paragraph 21, lines 3 – 14.** It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of KONSELLA with WEAVER in order to enable a wider array of commonly-used devices, such as infrared-capable PDAs (personal digital assistants), cell phones, and portable computers, the ability to function as a means of identification as taught by WEAVER.

18. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **WEAVER [US Patent Application 2003/0160992 A1]** in view of **OAKESON [US Patent 7,187,462 B2]**.

Regarding claim 10, WEAVER does not specifically teach the method,
wherein the scanner is used to read the tag.

However, OAKESON teaches a system and method for adjusting a print queue when a user is in proximity of the printing device. A printing device detects the identity of a user by means of a communication device. In a method similar to that disclosed by WEAVER, the communication device can be a "scanning device (e.g., card reader) that is configured to read one of a magnetic strip, barcode, two-dimensional (e.g., dot pattern) code, written text (i.e., through optical character recognition (OCR))"; **col. 4, lines 19 – 23.** In the case when the printing device is a multifunction printer (i.e., a device containing a scanning device), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of OAKESON with WEAVER in order to simplify system design and reduce cost by using the scanning device to read a barcode which is imprinted on the tag.

Regarding claim 11, WEAVER does not specifically teach the method of claim 1,
wherein the tag contains a bar code.

However, as previously mentioned for claim 10, OAKESON teaches a system and method for adjusting a print queue when a user is in proximity of the printing device. A printing device detects the identity of a user by means of a communication device. In a method similar to that disclosed by WEAVER, the communication device can be a "scanning device (e.g., card reader) that is configured to read one of a magnetic strip, barcode, two-dimensional (e.g., dot pattern) code, written text (i.e., through optical character recognition (OCR))"; **col. 4, lines 19 – 23.** In the case when the printing

Art Unit: 2609

device is a multifunction printer (i.e., a device containing a scanning device), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of OAKESON with WEAVER in order to simplify system design and reduce cost by using the scanning device to read a barcode which is imprinted on the tag.

Regarding claim 12, WEAVER does not teach the method of claim 1,

wherein the tag contains glyphs.

However, as previously mentioned for claim 10, OAKESON teaches a system and method for adjusting a print queue when a user is in proximity of the printing device. A printing device detects the identity of a user by means of a communication device. In a method similar to that disclosed by WEAVER, the communication device can be a "scanning device (e.g., card reader) that is configured to read one of a magnetic strip, barcode, two-dimensional (e.g., dot pattern) code, written text (i.e., through optical character recognition (OCR)"; **col. 4, lines 19 – 23.** In the case of a two-dimensional code (or glyph), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of OAKESON with WEAVER to provide additional user identification encoding methods that could be read by a scanning device.

Art Unit: 2609

19. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **WEAVER [US Patent Application 2003/0160992 A1]** in view of **KONSELLA [US Patent Application 2003/0206311 A1]**.

Regarding claim 16, WEAVER does not specifically teach the device of claim 15,
wherein the tag reading system communicates using infrared signals.

However, KONSELLA teaches a method and apparatus for providing personalized print content for a specific user. A printing device detects the identity of a user by means of a communication device. In a method similar to that disclosed by WEAVER, the "personal identification can also be provided electronically. For example, a badge, card, or some other personal item bearing a bar code, magnetic strip, memory chip, etc. can be swiped or temporarily inserted into printer 202. The personal identification can also be provided to printer 202 wirelessly (e.g., infrared, radio frequency transmitter, 802.11, etc."); **page 2, paragraph 21, lines 3 – 14.** It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of KONSELLA with WEAVER in order to enable a wider array of commonly-used devices, such as infrared-capable PDAs (personal digital assistants), cell phones, and portable computers, the ability to function as a means of identification as taught by WEAVER.

Art Unit: 2609

20. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **WEAVER [US Patent Application 2003/0160992 A1]** in view of **HIBINO [US Patent Application 2003/0093675 A1]**.

Regarding claim 18, WEAVER does not specifically teach the device of claim 18,
wherein the radio signals are Bluetooth™ signals.

However, HIBINO teaches a system to perform “confidential printing” in which a print job is only initiated once a user is in proximity of the printing device. Specifically, by means of a Bluetooth™-capable cell phone, “when the user of the PC 4 enters the Piconet area with the cell phone 6, which is powered ON, the printer detects the cell phone 6, and a printing job is initiated”; **page 8, paragraph 142.** It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of HIBINO with WEAVER to enable a Bluetooth™-capable cell phone to replace the tag as taught by WEAVER thereby, allowing a user to just carry his or her cell phone as an identification means.

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Art Unit: 2609

- U.S. Patent Application, 2003/0105849
- U.S. Patent Application, 2003/0038965
- U.S. Patent Application, 2003/0066878
- U.S. Patent Application, 2003/0210424

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter L. Cheng whose telephone number is 571-270-3007. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY - FRIDAY, 8:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, King Y. Poon can be reached on 571-272-7440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/685,320
Art Unit: 2609

Page 22

plc



KING V POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Supervising Patent